

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 38-40 have been amended. Claims 3-5 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, and 6-40 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 38-40 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 1, 2, 6-11, 24, and 32-37 are allowed.

Applicants note that the Examiner indicated that claims 1, 2, 6-11, 24, and 32-40 were pending in the Office Action in the Office Action Summary. However, claims 12-23 and 25-31 were never canceled and are also pending in the application. It is further noted that claims 12-23 and 25-31 depend from claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated to be allowable, and are allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 2, 10, 11, 13, and 14 and at page 14, lines 8-12; page 23, lines 18-23; and page 28, lines 17-22 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,828,951 issued to Yamazaki, et al. ("Yamazaki").

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Claim 38, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

a size of crystal grain on the channel region of the switching thin film transistor is larger than a size of the crystal grain on the channel region of the driving thin film transistor

Claim 40, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

a size of crystal grain on the channel area of the circuit thin film transistor is larger than a size of the crystal grain on the channel region of the pixel unit thin film transistor

Yamazaki fails to disclose at least these features of claims 38 and 40.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 38 and 40. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 38 and 40 are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamazaki, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,585 issued to Takano, et al. ("Takano").

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. I, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Telefex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, slip op. at 14-15 (2007). Furthermore, even if the prior art may be combined in the manner claimed, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference or

references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 39, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

the grain sizes of the channel regions of the driving thin film transistors are different for each of the colors of the sub-pixels

Yamazaki in view of Takano fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 39.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 39. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 39 are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 1, 2, 6-11, 24, 32-37 are allowed.

Claims 12-23 and 25-31 are also pending in the application and depend from allowable claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12-23 and 25-31 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: November 5, 2007

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/SLK/srb